REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed June 27, 2002. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1-33 remain pending in the present application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-33 have been preliminarily rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In this response, claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 18 and 26 have been amended. The foregoing amendments have been made for purposes of better defining the invention, and not in response to the rejections made based on prior art. Indeed, the Applicants submit that no substantive limitations or new matters have been added to the claims. The Applicants respectfully traverse all of the rejections of the Office Action. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Response to §103 Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-33 have been preliminarily rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,297,203, to Rose, *et al.* (hereafter, *Rose*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,705,940, to Newman, *et al.* (hereafter, *Newman*).

In order for a claim to be properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, the combined teachings of the prior art references must suggest all features of the claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. See, *e.g.*, *In Re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988), and *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

Prior to describing how *Rose* and *Newman* fail to disclose at least one element of claims 1-33, respectively, a discussion of the *Rose* reference and the *Newman* reference is offered.

A. Discussion of the *Rose* Reference

Rose appears to disclose a microprocessor based digital cordless telephone capable of transmitting both digitized voice data and digitized command data between a hand unit and a base unit (col. 1, lines 8-15). *Rose* further appears to disclose that the digital cordless telephone implements a standby mode, whereby the hand unit is idle and is waiting for a

valid keypad input or a valid command from the base unit. The digital cordless telephone implements a periodic power shut down of the receiver section during standby mode in order to extend the battery life while maintaining the capability to receive data inputs (col. 11, lines 15-25). During standby mode, the microprocessor awaits input from the base unit or the keypad input. If the microprocessor receives no input, the microprocessor turns off the receiver and transmittal power and then holds its own operation. A watchdog timer is set for one second unless the microprocessor commands otherwise. After one second, the watchdog timer resets the microprocessor, which in turn powers the receiver in order to read data from the base unit as well as the keypad. If no input is detected the power saving sequence is executed again.

B. Discussion of the *Newman* Reference

Newman appears to disclose a digital logic gate combined with analog monolithic microwave integrated circuits. The digital logic gate includes a logic branch including a first pair of metal electrode semiconductor field effect transistors. Each one of the transistors has a gate electrode, a source electrode, and a drain electrode. The logic gate further includes means disposed in the logic branch for reducing the nominal branch currents flowing between the drain electrode of a first transistor and a source electrode of a second transistor. The logic gate further includes a buffer branch including means disposed in the buffer branch for reducing nominal branch currents flowing between the drain electrode of the first transistor and the source electrode of the second transistor. The logic branch further includes an output branch including means disposed in the output branch for reducing nominal output branch currents flowing between source and drain electrodes of the output branch transistors. With such an arrangement, a low-power buffered logic family suitable for integration with and control of analog monolithic microwave integrated circuits is provided. By incorporating the current reducing means in each branch of the logic gate, the logic gate will dissipate substantially less power than a standard buffered FET logic family (col. 3, line 17 - col. 4, line 3).

Newman appears to disclose a level shifter, wherein the level shifter could be implemented to feed a signal to a switchable power amplifier, as can be seen by Fig. 5

where the level shifter feeds the signal V_{DDT} to supply voltage V_{DD} to an amplifier 50 (col. 8, lines 49-67).

C. **No suggestion or motivation to combine the references**

The Applicants respectfully submit that ""[o]bviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. Under section 103, teachings of references can be combined *only* if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so." ACS Hospital Systems, Inc., v. Montefiore Hospital, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577; 221 U.S.P.Q. 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984). In addition, "[t]here must be some reason, suggestion, or motivation found in the prior art whereby a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention would make the combination. " In re. Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1447, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). "Moreover, the question is not simply whether the prior art "teaches" the particular element of the invention, but whether it would suggest the desirability, and thus the obviousness, of making the combination." *ALCO Standard Corp. v. Tennessee Valley Authority*, 808 F.2d 1490, 1498, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1337, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Rose discloses a digital cordless telephone that implements a periodic power shut down of a receiver section during standby mode in order to extend battery life of the telephone while maintaining the capability to receive data inputs. In contrast, *Newman* discloses a digital logic gate combined with analog monolithic microwave integrated circuits such that the digital logic configured in an arrangement that dissipates substantially less power than a standard buffered FET logic family. The Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Rose* nor *Newman* provides reasons, suggestions or motivations to combine these technologies. Therefore, neither *Rose* nor *Newman* render the claims obvious, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

D. Even if Properly Combined, the Combination of *Rose* and *Newman* does not Disclose, Teach or Suggest all Elements of the Claims

1. Claim 1

Modified claim 1 recites:

> 1. A wireless communication device, comprising:
> a serial interface configured to accept input data at a first voltage, the input data including a control signal for an integrated circuit component;
> a local level shifter configured to accept a portion of the control signal at the first voltage, the local level shifter configured to maintain a shifted control signal, where the shifted control signal is at the operating voltage of the integrated circuit component, and where the shifted control signal controls the operation of the integrated circuit component; and
> a data latch configured to accept the portion of the control signal at the first voltage level from the serial interface, the data latch configured to output the portion of the control signal at the first voltage to at least the local level shifter, ***wherein the local level shifter is configured to maintain the shifted control signal while at least a portion of the wireless communication device is operating in a standby mode.***

(Emphasis Added)

The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least the above-emphasized element. Particularly, the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest a local level shifter that is configured to maintain a shifted control signal during a standby mode.

In preliminarily rejecting claim 1, the Office Action recites:

> Consider claims 1, 3-7, 9-15, Rose teaches a wireless communication device comprising: an interface between the baseband control logic IC and the RF operation portions (Rose see especially fig 10), the wireless device having a standby mode (Rose col. 25, lines 4-20). Rose lacks a teaching of the interface including data latches and level shifters to convert the voltage between the control section and the operation portions. Newman teaches an IC interface including data latches and level shifters to convert voltage between control and operation sections (Newman see especially col. 4, lines 4-32, col. 8, lines 49-68, col. 11, lines 16-35). Newman teaches that this arrangement allows lower power dissipation and for the circuitry to be fabricated on a common substrate (Newman col. 3, line 55 - col 4, line 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to modify Rose to use the interface arrangement of Newman in order to provide lower dissipation and for the circuitry to be fabricated on a common substrate.

As noted above, the Office Action does not address a local level shifter configured to maintain a shifted control signal during a standby mode. In fact, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Rose* nor *Newman* disclose, teach or suggest use of a level shifter during a standby mode of at least a portion of a wireless communication device.

Rose discloses a digital cordless telephone that implements a standby mode. *Rose*, however, does not disclose, teach or suggest use of a level shifter during standby mode. In addition, *Rose* does not disclose, teach or suggest maintaining a shifted control signal during standby mode. Instead, *Rose* discloses a digital cordless telephone that implements a periodic power shut down of a receiver section during standby mode in order to extend battery life of the telephone while maintaining the capability to receive data inputs (col. 11, lines 15-25).

Newman discloses a digital logic gate configured to reduce currents flowing between source and drain electrodes of transistors. *Newman* discloses a level shifter configured to feed a signal to a switchable power amplifier (fig.5, col. 8, lines 49-67). Those having ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that level shifters are generally utilized for feeding signals to logic devices. *Newman*, however, does not disclose, teach or suggest maintaining a shifted control signal during standby mode via use of the level shifter. Instead, *Newman* discloses a digital logic gate combined with analog monolithic microwave integrated circuits such that the digital logic is configured in an arrangement that dissipates substantially less power than a standard buffered FET logic family.

In addition, *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest a standby mode. Therefore, *Newman* could not disclose, teach or suggest the use of a level shifter during standby mode despite the fact that *Newman* discloses use of a level shifter. In addition, *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest maintaining a shifted control signal during standby mode. Instead, *Newman* merely discloses a level shifter for feeding a signal to logic devices.

Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that combination of *Rose* and *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest all elements recited by claim 1. Specifically,

neither *Rose* nor *Newman* disclose, teach or suggest at least the element of a local level shifter configured to maintain a shifted control signal during a standby mode. Therefore, the combination of *Rose* in view of *Newman* does not render claim 1 obvious, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

2. Claim 2

Modified claim 2 recites:

> 2. The wireless communication device of claim 1, further comprising:
>
> a second local level shifter, the second local level shifter configured to accept a second portion of the control signal at the first voltage, the second local level shifter being configured to maintain a second shifted control signal, where the second shifted control signal is at the operating voltage of a second integrated circuit component, where the second shifted control signal controls the operation of the second integrated circuit component;
>
> a second data latch, the second data latch configured to accept the second portion of the control signal at the first voltage level from the serial interface, the second data latch configured to output the second portion of the control signal at the first voltage level to the second local level shifter, ***where the second local level shifter is configured to maintain the second shifted control signal while the at least a portion of the wireless communication device is operating in the standby mode.***

(Emphasis Added)

The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least the above-emphasized element. Particularly, the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest a second local level shifter configured to maintain a second shifted control signal during a standby mode.

In preliminarily rejecting claim 2, the Office Action recites:

> As to claims 2, 16, 24, Rose in view of Newman lack a teaching of second level shifter. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a level shifter for each component to be controlled.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action does not address a second level shifter configured to maintain a second shifted control signal during a standby mode of at least a portion of a wireless communication device. In fact, the

Applicants submit that neither *Rose* nor *Newman* disclose, teach or suggest use of a second local level shifter during standby mode of at least a portion of the wireless communication device.

The Applicants respectfully submit that *Rose* does not disclose, teach or suggest use of a second level shifter during standby mode. In fact, as stated above with reference to claim 1, *Rose* does not disclose, teach or suggest use of a level shifter at all. Therefore, since *Rose* does not disclose, teach or suggest use of a level shifter, *Rose* could not disclose, teach or suggest maintaining a second shifted control signal during standby mode via the second local level shifter.

In addition, the Applicants respectfully submit that *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest a standby mode. Therefore, *Newman* could not disclose, teach or suggest use of a level shifter during a standby mode despite the fact that *Newman* discloses use of a level shifter. Specifically, as mentioned above with reference to claim 1, *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest a standby mode. In addition, *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest maintaining a shifted control signal during a standby mode, particularly via use of a local level shifter. Instead, *Newman* merely discloses a level shifter for feeding a signal to logic devices.

Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 2 contains all features of its respective independent claim 1. Since independent claim 1 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claim 2 should also be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

3. **Claims 3-9**

The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-9 depend directly on independent claim 1. Since independent claim 1 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 3-9 should also be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

4. **Claim 10**

Modified claim 10 recites:

> 10. ***A system for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode***, comprising:
>
> means for accepting input data at a first voltage, the input data including control signals for a plurality of integrated circuit components;
>
> means for distributing the control signals to the plurality of integrated circuit components;
>
> means for converting the control signals at the first voltage to shifted control signals at the operating voltage of the integrated circuit components; and
>
> ***means for maintaining the shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode.***

(Emphasis Added)

The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least the above-emphasized elements. Particularly, the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest "a system for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode." In addition, the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest "means for maintaining shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode."

In preliminarily rejecting claim 1, the Office Action recites:

> Consider claims 1, 3-7, 9-15, Rose teaches a wireless communication device comprising: an interface between the baseband control logic IC and the RF operation portions (Rose see especially fig 10), the wireless device having a standby mode (Rose col. 25, lines 4-20). Rose lacks a teaching of the interface including data latches and level shifters to convert the voltage between the control section and the operation portions. Newman teaches an IC interface including data latches and level shifters to convert voltage between control and operation sections (Newman see especially col. 4, lines 4-32, col. 8, lines 49-68, col. 11, lines 16-35). Newman teaches that this arrangement allows lower power dissipation and for the circuitry to be fabricated on a common substrate (Newman col. 3, line 55 - col 4, line 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rose to use the interface arrangement of Newman in order to provide lower dissipation and for the circuitry to be fabricated on a common substrate.

As noted above, the Office Action does not address a system for maintaining programming information during a standby mode. In addition, the Office Action does not

address "means for maintaining shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode." The Applicants respectfully submit that neither *Rose* nor *Newman* disclose, teach or suggest a system for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. Further, the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest the element of "means for maintaining the shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode."

Rose discloses a digital cordless telephone that implements a standby mode. *Rose*, however, does not disclose, teach or suggest a system for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, *Rose* does not disclose, teach or suggest "means for maintaining shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode." Instead, *Rose* discloses a digital cordless telephone that implements a periodic power shut down of a receiver section during standby mode in order to extend battery life of the telephone while maintaining the capability to receive data inputs (col. 11, lines 15-25).

Newman discloses a digital logic gate configured to reduce currents flowing between source and drain electrodes of transistors. *Newman*, however, does not disclose, teach or suggest a system for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest mechanisms for maintaining shifted control signals at integrated circuit components during standby mode. Instead, *Newman* discloses a digital logic gate combined with analog monolithic microwave integrated circuits such that the digital logic is configured in an arrangement that dissipates substantially less power than a standard buffered FET logic family.

In addition, *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest a standby mode. Therefore, *Newman* could not teach a system for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest mechanisms for maintaining shifted control signals at integrated circuit components during the standby mode. Instead, *Newman* merely discloses a level shifter for feeding a signal to logic devices.

Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest all elements of claim 10. Specifically, neither *Rose* nor *Newman* disclose, teach or suggest a system for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, neither *Rose* nor *Newman* disclose, teach or suggest the element of "means for maintaining the shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode." Therefore, the combination of *Rose* in view of *Newman* does not render claim 10 obvious, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

5. **Claims 11-17**

The Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 11-17 contain all features of their respective independent claim 10. Since independent claim 10 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 11-17 should also be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

6. **Claim 18**

Modified claim 18 recites:

> 18. ***A method for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode***, comprising the steps of:
>
> accepting integrated circuit input data at a first voltage, the input data including control signals for a plurality of integrated circuit components;
>
> distributing the control signals to the plurality of integrated circuit components;
>
> converting the control signals at the first voltage to shifted control signals at the operating voltage of the integrated circuit components; and
>
> ***maintaining the shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode***.

(Emphasis Added)

The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least the above-emphasized elements. Particularly, the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest a method for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In

addition, the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest the step of "maintaining the shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode."

In preliminarily rejecting claim 18, the Office Action recites:

> As to claims 18-23, the system of Rose in view of Newman would perform the claimed steps.

As noted above, the Office Action does not address a method for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, the Office Action does not address the step of "maintaining the shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode." In fact, the Applicants submit that neither *Rose* nor *Newman* disclose, teach or suggest a method for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. Further, the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest the element of "maintaining the shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode."

Rose discloses a digital cordless telephone that implements a standby mode. *Rose*, however, does not disclose, teach or suggest a method for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, *Rose* does not disclose, teach or suggest the step of "maintaining the shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode." Instead, *Rose* discloses a digital cordless telephone that implements a periodic power shut down of a receiver section during standby mode in order to extend battery life of the telephone while maintaining the capability to receive data inputs (col. 11, lines 15-25).

Newman discloses a digital logic gate configured to reduce currents flowing between source and drain electrodes of transistors. *Newman*, however, does not disclose, teach or suggest a method for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest the step of "maintaining the shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode." Instead, *Newman* discloses a digital logic gate combined with analog monolithic microwave integrated circuits such that the digital logic is configured in

an arrangement that dissipates substantially less power than a standard buffered FET logic family.

In addition, *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest a standby mode. Therefore, *Newman* could not teach a method for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest the step of "maintaining the shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode." Instead, *Newman* merely discloses a level shifter for feeding a signal to logic devices.

Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest all elements of claim 18. Specifically, neither *Rose* nor *Newman* disclose, teach or suggest a method for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, neither *Rose* nor *Newman* disclose, teach or suggest at least the element of "maintaining the shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode." Therefore, the combination of *Rose* in view of *Newman* does not render claim 18 obvious, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

7. **Claims 19-25**

The Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 19-25 contain all features of their respective independent claim 18. Since independent claim 18 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 19-25 should also be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

8. **Claim 26**

Modified claim 26 recites:

> 26. ***A computer readable medium having a program for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode***, comprising:

> logic for accepting input data at a first voltage, the input data including control signals for a plurality of integrated circuit components;
>
> logic for distributing the control signals to the plurality of integrated circuit components;
>
> logic for converting the control signals at the first voltage to shifted control signals at the operating voltage of the integrated circuit components; and
>
> ***logic for maintaining the shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode.***

(Emphasis Added)

The Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least the above-emphasized elements. Particularly, the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest a computer readable medium having a program for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* fails to disclose, teach or suggest a logic for maintaining shifted control signals at integrated circuit components during the standby mode.

In preliminarily rejecting claim 26, the Office Action recites:

> As to claims 26-33, Rose in view of Newman teaches everything claimed except for storing the method on a computer readable medium. Official Notice is taken that it is notoriously well known in the art to store methods on computer readable medium in order to allow for the methods to be easily updated and loaded on different systems. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rose in view of Newman to store the method on computer readable media in order to allow the method to be easily updated and loaded on different systems.

As noted above, the Office Action does not address a computer readable medium having a program for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, the Office Action does not address logic for maintaining shifted control signals at integrated circuit components during the standby mode. In fact, the Applicants submit that neither *Rose* nor *Newman* disclose, teach or suggest a computer readable medium having a program for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. Further, the combination of Rose and Newman does not disclose, teach or suggest the element of "logic for maintaining the shifted control signals at the integrated circuit components during the standby mode."

Rose discloses to a digital cordless telephone that implements a standby mode. *Rose*, however, does not disclose, teach or suggest a computer readable medium having a program for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, *Rose* does not disclose, teach or suggest logic for maintaining shifted control signals at integrated circuit components during the standby mode. Instead, *Rose* discloses a digital cordless telephone that implements a periodic power shut down of a receiver section during standby mode in order to extend battery life of the telephone while maintaining the capability to receive data inputs (col. 11, lines 15-25).

Newman discloses to a digital logic gate configured to reduce currents flowing between source and drain electrodes of transistors. *Newman*, however, does not disclose, teach or suggest a computer readable medium having a program for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest logic for maintaining shifted control signals at integrated circuit components during the standby mode. Instead, *Newman* discloses a digital logic gate combined with analog monolithic microwave integrated circuits such that the digital logic is configured in an arrangement that dissipates substantially less power than a standard buffered FET logic family.

In addition, *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest a standby mode. Therefore, *Newman* could not disclose, teach or suggest a computer readable medium having a program for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode. In addition, *Newman* could not disclose, teach or suggest logic for maintaining shifted control signals at integrated circuit components during the standby mode. Instead, *Newman* merely discloses a level shifter for feeding a signal to logic devices.

Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of *Rose* and *Newman* does not disclose, teach or suggest all elements of claim 26. Specifically, neither *Rose* nor *Newman* disclose, teach or suggest a computer readable medium having a program for maintaining programming information in an integrated circuit during a standby mode as in claim 26. In addition, neither *Rose* nor *Newman* disclose, teach or suggest at least the element of "logic for maintaining the shifted control signals at the

integrated circuit components during the standby mode." Therefore, the combination of *Rose* in view of *Newman* does not render claim 26 obvious, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

9. Claims 27-33

The Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 27-33 contain all features of their respective independent claim 26. Since independent claim 26 should be allowed, as argued hereinabove, pending dependent claims 27-33 should also be allowed as a matter of law for at least this reason. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the presently pending claims 1-33 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all presently pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

M. Paul Qualey, Reg. No. 43,024

THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Box: _____,
Washington D.C. 20231,
on August 29, 2002.

Cory Rose
Signature